



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,313	02/25/2004	Ravipal S. Soin	MSFT-3501/300585.03	3447

23377 7590 10/29/2008
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

RECEK, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2442

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/786,313	Applicant(s) SOIN ET AL.	
	Examiner JASON RECEK	Art Unit 2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-17 and 19-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-17 and 19-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the RCE filed on August 7th 2008 which concerns application 10/786313.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/07/2008 has been entered.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-56 are pending, claims 2 and 18 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-56 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 44-48 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pg. 13-20, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 3-17, 19-56 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Art Unit: 2442

Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Acharya et al. US 2005/0036509 A1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 44, it is nominally directed to a device (machine) however no physical elements are present in the claim. Claim 49 indicates that all of the limitations can be performed by executable modules (software). Since there are no physical elements in the claim, the scope of the claim covers an embodiment that consists entirely of software. Software per se is not patentable. Thus, the claim does not constitute one of the four statutory categories of invention as provided by 35 U.S.C. 101. See MPEP 2601.01.

Regarding claims 45-48, they do not add any limitations that would render the subject matter patentable. Therefore they are also rejected since they depend from a rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acharya et al. US 2005/0036509 A1 in view of Parsons, Jr. et al. US 6,349,337 B1.

Regarding claim 1, Acharya discloses “discovering in the sender device, at least one of a plurality of alternate display devices by using ... Universal Plug and Play ... or listening for a wireless advertisement” as a user is presented a list of projectors by the wireless device (Fig. 3 item 320, Fig. 4 item 420, paragraphs 9, 36, 51, 54-56), “establishing a remote session” (paragraph 52), and “transmitting from the sender device to the at least one alternate display device, said content that is rendered thereon, on the at least one alternate display device” (Fig. 3 item 350).

Acharya does not explicitly disclose “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the sender device and the at least one alternate display device” however this is taught by Parsons as a communication session between client and server using a remote protocol (col. 6 ln. 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a remoting protocol for the purpose of connecting to a device over a network. Creating remote sessions between network devices by using a remote

Art Unit: 2442

protocol is well known in the art and yields predictable results, as evidenced by Parsons, Jr.

Acharya and Parsons do not explicitly disclose “the establishing comprising generation of a ticket that provides information on how to connect to the sender device” however such a feature is well known in the art. One example is KERBEROS authentication. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Acharya and Parsons with the generation of a ticket for connection / authentication. Such a modification is merely the combination of known elements according to their established function in order to yield a predictable result.

Regarding claim 3, Acharya does not disclose “the remoting protocol is the remote desktop protocol and the remote session is a terminal services (TS) session” however this is taught by Parsons, Jr. as using the Remote Desktop Protocol (col. 6 ln. 43-50) which would necessary include a terminal session.

Regarding claim 4, Acharya discloses “authoring said content” since the data must be created by someone (paragraph 7).

Regarding claim 5, Acharya discloses “publishing said content” as sending it to the display device (paragraph 7-8).

Art Unit: 2442

2. Claims 6, 10, 13-17, 19-31 and 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acharya and Parsons, Jr. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Masumoto et al. US 6,943,752 B2.

Regarding claim 6, Acharya and Parsons Jr. do not disclose “content authored before said publishing comprises private content and public content” however this is taught by Masumoto as some of the content is not displayed on the display device (col. 5 ln. 15-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Acharya and Parsons with the teachings of Masumoto for the purpose of improving a presentation. Masumoto suggests that by having private and public content a presentation can be improved (col. 3 ln. 15-55).

Regarding claim 10, Acharya discloses “the content is substantially simultaneously displayed on the at least one alternate display device in response to said transmitting” as showing the display (paragraph 54).

Regarding claim 13, Acharya discloses “said content is a slide presentation” as a slide presentation (Fig. 28).

Regarding claim 14, Acharya, Parsons and Masumoto do not expressly disclose “displaying via a second user interface mechanism an indication of a signal strength

Art Unit: 2442

associated with the remote session” however this is well known in the art when dealing with wireless networks to display a signal strength, it yields predictable results in that a user will know when a signal (network) is available.

Regarding claim 15, Acharya, Masumoto and Parsons do not expressly disclose “transmitting only said public content of the selected content to the at least one alternate display device” however the method and system taught by Masumoto achieves the result of only showing the public content. Masumoto teaches “hiding” the private content rather than not transferring it however the result is the same either way. Thus the motivation for transmitting only public content is to hide private content which is exactly what Masumoto discloses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to simply not transfer the private data for the purpose of keeping it private, especially given the motivation and teaching of Masumoto.

Regarding claim 16, it is a computer readable medium that corresponds to claim 1, thus it is rejected for similar reasons.

Regarding claim 17, it is a device that corresponds to claim 1, thus it is rejected for similar reasons.

Regarding claim 19, it is a medium claim that contains similar limitations as claim 1, those similar limitations are rejected for the same reasons.

Acharya also discloses “displaying a user interface on the computing device” (Fig. 28).

Acharya and Parsons Jr. do not disclose “selecting ... the content including the at least one public portion” however this is taught by Masumoto as some of the content is not displayed on the display device (col. 5 ln. 15-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Acharya and Parsons with the teachings of Masumoto for the purpose of improving a presentation. Masumoto suggests that by having private and public content a presentation can be improved (col. 3 ln. 15-55).

Regarding claim 20, Acharya and Parsons Jr. do not disclose “generating a first content version including the at least one public portion and altering said first content version thereby forming a second content version, whereby the difference ... comprises said at least one private portion” however this is taught by Masumoto as a presentation that contains data which is kept private (col. 5 ln. 15-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Acharya and Parsons with the teachings of Masumoto for the purpose of improving a presentation. Masumoto suggests that by having private and public content a presentation can be improved (col. 3 ln. 15-55).

Regarding claim 21, Acharya discloses “publishing” as sending it to the display device (paragraph 7-8).

Regarding claim 22, Acharya discloses “said computing device is a stylus pen input device and said publishing includes printing said at least one public portion to a journal” as using PDAs as the wireless computing device and printing content to be presented (paragraph 6).

Regarding claim 23, Acharya and Parsons, Jr. do not explicitly disclose “said altering includes designating at least one of adding to, masking, highlighting, annotating and deleting from said first content version” Masumoto teaches this as highlighting content to mark it as private (col. 15 ln. 65-67), deleting content (col. 15 ln. 67 – col. 16 ln. 2), and marking content as private (col. 16 ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Acharya and Parsons with the teachings of Masumoto for the purpose of improving a presentation. Masumoto suggests that by having private and public content a presentation can be improved (col. 3 ln. 15-55).

Regarding claim 24, Acharya and Parsons do not explicitly disclose “using a session token for controlling the at least one of the other computing devices” however such a feature is well known in the art. One example is KERBEROS authentication. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Acharya and Parsons with the generation of a ticket for connection /

Art Unit: 2442

authentication. Such a modification is merely the combination of known elements according to their established function in order to yield a predictable result.

Regarding claim 25, Acharya discloses “placing said computing device in an “available for discovery” state” as PDAs include such a features (paragraph 7).

Regarding claim 26, Acharya and Parsons, Jr. do not explicitly disclose “a client projection window which shows said at least one public portion” however Masumoto teaches this as displaying a slide image which is public (col. 3 ln. 18-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Acharya and Parsons with the teachings of Masumoto for the purpose of improving a presentation. Masumoto suggests that by having private and public content a presentation can be improved (col. 3 ln. 15-55).

Regarding claim 27, Acharya discloses “[a portion] is rendered substantially simultaneously [in response to transmitting]” as showing the display (paragraph 54).

Acharya and Parsons, Jr. do not explicitly disclose “at least one private portion and said at least one public portion” however Masumoto teaches this as a presentation that contains public and private portions (col. 3 ln. 18-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Acharya and Parsons with the teachings of Masumoto for the

Art Unit: 2442

purpose of improving a presentation. Masumoto suggests that by having private and public content a presentation can be improved (col. 3 ln. 15-55).

Regarding claims 28, 29 and 30 Acharya and Parsons, Jr. do not explicitly disclose "controlling the rendering", "controlling a rate of viewing" and "controls rendering of said at least one public portion and said at least one private portion" however all these are taught by Masumoto as selecting what content to show (col. 5 ln. 15-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Acharya and Parsons with the teachings of Masumoto for the purpose of improving a presentation. Masumoto suggests that by having private and public content a presentation can be improved (col. 3 ln. 15-55).

Regarding claim 31, it is a medium claim that corresponds to the method claim 15 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claims 49-56 they substantially correspond to claims 19-21, 23-24 and 27-29 respectively, the corresponding parts are rejected for the same reasons. Any differences are discussed below.

Regarding claim 49, Acharya discloses "a wireless "available for discovery" signal" as PDAs have such a feature (paragraph 7).

3. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acharya, Parsons and Masumoto in view of Orfitelli et al. U.S. 6,904,451 B1.

Regarding claim 7, Acharya and Parsons do not disclose “designating [...] at least one portion of the content as private content” however this is taught by Masumoto as displaying only a portion of the content (col. 5 ln. 15-19). The motivation to combine is the same as that given above. Acharya, Parsons and Masumoto do not disclose doing this “via a second user interface mechanism” but this is taught by Orfitelli as a touch screen computer that is used to control a presentation (col. 3 ln. 31-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Acharya, Parsons and Masumoto by adding a second user interface as taught by Orfitelli. Orfitelli teaches that by having a second interface a user can control the presentation while at the podium or walking around the room (col. 3 ln. 38-44), this is obviously an advantage.

Regarding claim 8, Acharya and Parsons do not disclose “said authoring includes designating at least one alternation of said public content as private content” however this is taught by Masumoto as marking data as comments so they are not displayed to the public (col. 16 ln. 33-38). The motivation to combine Masumoto with Acharya and Parsons is given above.

Regarding claim 9, Acharya and Parsons do not disclose “said authoring includes designating at least one of a masking, a deletion, and a highlighting of said content as private content” however this is taught by Masumoto as highlighting content to mark it as private (col. 15 ln. 65-67), deleting content (col. 15 ln. 67 – col. 16 ln. 2), and marking content as private (col. 16 ln. 36-37). The motivation to combine is the same as that given above.

4. Claims 11-12 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto, Parsons and Acharya in view of Zhang et al. “Software Solution to Completely Wireless Presentation” 2001.

Regarding claim 11, Acharya, Parsons and Masumoto do not disclose “controlling the display of a public portion of the content on said at least one alternate display device via a second user interface mechanism on said sender device” however this is taught by Zhang as a user interface for application presentation (content selection) and a user interface for controlling the presentation (control mechanism) see pg. 463 section 4.4 User Interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Acharya, Parsons and Masumoto by providing another user interface for the purpose of controlling the presentation. By providing a separate

Art Unit: 2442

interface for the controls and the content, the user is able to more clearly see the content since the controls are in a separate user interface and not intermixed with the presentation content.

Regarding claim 12, Masumoto discloses “said controlling includes controlling a rate of viewing of said content via at least one input device of said computing device” as a computer connected to a projector in which the computer controls the presentation (col. 5 ln. 2-3, Fig. 1), also a remote control may be used (col. 5 ln. 4-5, Fig. 5). This motivation for combining Acharya and Parsons with Masumoto is given above.

Regarding claim 32, Acharya discloses “at least one projector device” as a projector (Fig. 1), and “at least one available other notebook computer” as other devices (Fig. 2).

5. Claims 33 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Masumoto and in view of Parsons Jr. and Acharya.

Regarding claim 33, Zhang discloses “a server” as a server (pg. 460 section 3), “a user interface” as a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4), and “a transmitter” as all computing devices are in wireless communication so they must include a transmitter (pg. 463 section 5, Fig. 6). Zhang does not disclose “public content and private content” nor “only the public content is rendered” however this is taught by Masumoto as having

Art Unit: 2442

public and private content and only displaying the public content (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig. 5).

Zhang does not disclose “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the server computing device and the at least one client display device” however this is suggested by Masumoto as the computer and display device are connected on a wireless network (Masumoto col. 16 ln. 8) which would necessary use some protocol. Applicant has argued that it is not inherent that a wireless session would use a protocol. Although it is still the examiner's position that a wireless communication session inherently uses some sort of protocol (if there was no protocol the session could not be established because the devices would not know how to communicate with each other), Parsons explicitly discloses this as a communication session between client and server using a remote protocol (col. 6 ln. 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use remote sessions for the purpose of connecting to a device over a network. Creating remote sessions between network devices by using a remote protocol is well known in the art and yields predictable results, as evidenced by Parsons, Jr.

Zhang, Masumoto and Parsons do not explicitly disclose "a wireless "available for discovery" signal" however this is taught by Acharya as using PDAs which have this capability (paragraph 7)"

The motivation to combine these references is given above.

Regarding claim 34, Zhang discloses "an authoring tool" as the server is connected to the projector and thus must contain the presentation software (pg. 460 section 3.1).

Regarding claim 35, Zhang discloses "a publishing tool" as the server must "publish" the material to the projector / other computing devices (pg. 460 section 3.1, pg. 462 section 4.3 Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 36, Zhang does not disclose "said publishing is said public content and wherein at least one alteration to said public content after publishing with the publishing tool is said private content" however this is taught by Masumoto as converting data from public content to private content (col. 15 ln. 63-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation

Art Unit: 2442

for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 37, Zhang does not disclose “at least one portion of the content is designated as private content via said user interface” however this is taught by Masumoto as designated portions as private content (col. 17 ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 38, Zhang does not disclose “at least one alteration of said public content made via said authoring tool is designated as private content” however this is taught by Masumoto as designating private content, such content can be an alteration of said public content (col. 16 ln. 33-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation

Art Unit: 2442

for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 39, Zhang does not disclose “at least one alteration includes at least one of a masking, a deletion, an annotating and a highlighting” however this is taught by Masumoto as highlighting content to mark it as private (col. 15 ln. 65-67), deleting content (col. 15 ln. 67 – col. 16 ln. 2), and marking content as private (col. 16 ln. 36-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without allowing the audience to see the notes.

Regarding claim 40, Zhang discloses “the rendering of the public content on said at least one client display device is controlled via said user interface” as controlling a display through a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4)

Regarding claim 41, Zhang does not specifically disclose “control of a rate of display” however Masumoto teaches using slides for a presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50) and a slide presentation inherently has a rate control.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the presentation system of Zhang to use slide presentation applications. Such applications are well known and yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 42, Zhang does not specifically disclose “said content is a slide presentation however this is taught by Masumoto as using slides for a presentation (col. 1 ln. 49-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the presentation system of Zhang to use slide presentation applications. Such applications are well known and yield predictable results.

Regarding claim 43, neither Zhang nor Masumoto expressly disclose “transmits only said public content of the selected content to the at least one client display device” however the method and system taught by Masumoto achieves the result of only showing the public content. Masumoto teaches “hiding” the private content rather than not transferring it however the result is the same either way. Thus the motivation for transmitting only public content is to hide private content which is exactly what Masumoto discloses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to simply not transfer the private data for the purpose of keeping it private, especially given the motivation and teaching of Masumoto.

Regarding claim 44, Zhang discloses “a user interface” as a user interface (pg. 463 section 4.4), “means for displaying” as laptop with a display screen (pg. 459 section 1), and “means for transmitting” as all computing devices are in wireless communication so they must include a transmitter (pg. 463 section 5, Fig. 6). Zhang does not disclose “public content and private content” nor “only the public content is rendered” however this is taught by Masumoto as having public and private content and only displaying the public content (col. 5 ln. 15-19, Fig. 5).

Zhang does not disclose “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between the computing device and the at least one alternate display device” however this is suggested by Masumoto as the computer and display device are connected on a wireless network (Masumoto col. 16 ln. 8) which would necessary use some protocol. Applicant has argued that it is not inherent that a wireless session would use a protocol. Although it is still the examiner's position that a wireless communication session inherently uses some sort of protocol (if there was no protocol the session could not be established because the devices would not know how to communicate with each other), Parsons explicitly discloses this as a communication session between client and server using a remote protocol (col. 6 ln. 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation. The motivation for doing so is provided by Masumoto as allowing the presenter to refer to notes without

Art Unit: 2442

allowing the audience to see the notes. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use remote sessions for the purpose of connecting to a device over a network. Creating remote sessions between network devices by using a remote protocol is well known in the art and yields predictable results, as evidenced by Parsons, Jr.

Zhang, Masumoto and Parsons do not explicitly disclose "a wireless "available for discovery" signal" however this is taught by Acharya as using PDAs which have this capability (paragraph 7)"

The motivation to combine these references is given above.

Regarding claims 45-48, they correspond to claims 36-37, 40 and 43 respectively, thus they are rejected for the same reasons given above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON RECEK whose telephone number is (571)270-1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2442

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2442

/Jason Recek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

(571)-270-1975